MAY, 1967 VOL. IV, NO. 5

PERSUASION®

VIEWS

THE DRAFT PART VII:
GENERAL HERSHEY'S CARROT....by David J. Dawson

REVIEWS

ARGUMENT FROM OBSOLESCENCE
a review of Bruce K. Chapman's
The Wrong Man in Uniform:
Our Unfair and Obsolete Draft--
And How We Can Replace It.....by Lowell B. Wiltbank

JOAN KENNEDY TAYLOR, editor 50¢

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Published monthly by Persuasion, Inc., 260 West 86th Street, New York, N. Y. 10024. Subscription rate: $5.00 per year ($6.00 outside U. S., Canada and Mexico). Canadian residents add 8% foreign exchange.

Please include ZIP code number with your address.

Publisher.....*David J. Dawson*
Editor.....*Joan Kennedy Taylor*
Staff.....*Elenore Boddy*
Avis Brick
Joyce Jones
Lois Roberts

Persuasion is a trade mark registered with the United States Patent Office.

Copyright © 1967 by Persuasion, Inc.

All rights reserved—no reproduction in whole or in part without permission.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MAY, 1967 VOL.IV, NO. 5

VIEWS

The Draft Part VII:
General Hershey's Carrot

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why do we have the draft? What is its purpose? What is the nation, and the men who are drafted, supposed to gain from compulsory military service?

Defense is its official reason for being. In the words of the law: "The Congress hereby declares that an adequate armed strength must be achieved and maintained to insure the security of this Nation." To achieve this, the law states "it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States . . . to present himself for and submit to registration."

Most people, the bulk of the electorate and of the Congress, although they agree that only the draft can assure national security, regard it as at best a necessary evil. Even L. Mendel Rivers, the staunchly pro-draft chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, reflects this public attitude. "We do need a draft law for now and for the foreseeable future," he says, but also notes that "a law conscripting manpower must necessarily always be unpalatable," and that "conscription is inimical to our basic concept of freedom." But, he continues, we must draft, since the "alternatives can only result in jeopardizing our national security."

This is an argument which it is hard for even those opposed to the draft to entirely disagree with. In an informal poll conducted by the author this Spring among college students, only 33 percent of those queried at a medium-sized university near New York City thought the government should have the power to draft. But when asked if the government should draft to repel an invasion, 70 percent

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the same group said "yes." Students at a large southern university answered the same questionnaire, and while 80 percent of them said that the government should have the power to draft, 91 percent said it should draft in the event of invasion.

It is obvious that many of these students have in mind a vision of the frontier settlement coming together to throw back an Indian attack, or of Paul Revere rousing the countryside, and that they are loathe to deny the power of the community to rise up to repel invaders. This mistaken but understandable notion is the basis for the popular support of the draft. Justifying the draft in the name of "national security" makes sense to many people, particularly when none of the government leaders most concerned have seriously sought to develop a voluntary alternative. Thus the draft is to most citizens a regrettable but necessary military expedient. Lacking arguments or evidence to the contrary, these citizens can only feel a guilty, unworded sense of letting the country down if they oppose the draft. After all, what kind of American would advocate something that could end up jeopardizing our national security?

But this is not the only attitude supporting the draft. There is also an ominous minority position, ominous because it is held by many government leaders. This is the position that the draft is necessary, not only to the national security, but to the national *interest*. And what a difference one word can make!

The idea of national *security* in its military sense is a fairly objective one. To preserve

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

our security militarily means to take those actions necessary to protect the social system as a whole, and its territory, from destruction by belligerent foreign powers. This certainly could include the concept of maintaining deterrent forces--which ones, and how large they should be, would be technical strategic questions.

But what is the national *interest*? Although time after time it was cited as the justification of some aspect or other of the draft during the House Armed Services Hearings on the Selective Service in June, 1966, not once was there an attempt to define it. It is simply whatever the speaker holds to be good for the nation. Since it is obvious that everyone would agree that national security would be in the national interest, a gradual transmutation seems to take place, by which it is assumed that anything held to be in the national interest is necessarily therefore for the national security. The draft law itself states, "The Congress further declares that adequate provision for national security requires maximum effort in the fields of scientific research and development, and the fullest possible utilization of the nation's technological, scientific, and other critical manpower resources."

This paragraph has been broadly interpreted by General Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System for over a generation, and perhaps the foremost transmuter of the idea of national security into the idea of national interest. This is how he interprets the admonition of Congress to effect "the fullest possible utilization of . . . critical manpower resources."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"If we want physicians, dentists and allied specialists, scientists, engineers, teachers, and other skills which may be critical tomorrow, we must today train people to acquire, use, or teach those skills. If the Nation needs those who are trained, it should be prepared to defer them when the needs of the Armed Forces permit, and the individual continues to serve the national interest." (1966 *Hearings*, p. 9621)

Exactly how are these manpower resources ensured for the future? Through the application of a simultaneous bribe and threat--the offering of a privilege (freedom to gain an education) which will postpone an obligation (compulsory military service). In Hershey's words, "The deferment is the carrot that we have used to try to get individuals into occupations and professions that are said by those in charge of Government to be the necessary ones." (quoted in the 1966 *Hearings*, p. 9805)

An interesting metaphor. Getting a donkey to go where you want it to by dangling a carrot just over its head will work, because the donkey doesn't know that you are tricking him and will never let him reach that carrot until he has gone where you want him to. How successful has General Hershey's "carroting" been? If his figures are even approximately accurate, it has been very successful.

"From 1952-53 through 1963-64," he reported, "the number of engineering degrees increased from about 27,000 or 28,000 a year to nearly 48,000 each year. . . . Over this period, masters' doctors' [sic] degrees increased about threefold. . . . In 1949-50 about 29 percent of the teachers were men.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In 1961-62, about 37 percent were men." (1966 *Hearings*, p. 9622) And later he pointed out that "in 1950-51 we were graduating 400 doctors of philosophy a year. Now we are getting around 5,000 or 6,000 or 7,000." (1966 *Hearings*, p. 9653)

The fact that the draft function has been knowingly broadened by him to achieve purposes not solely military is indicated by the following statement: "By deferment we can influence people to train themselves and to use the skills they acquire in work critical to the Nation, in *civilian* or in military life." (1966 *Hearings*, p. 9623. Italics mine.)

Deferment allows control to be exercised throughout every man's youth. Once a man is deferred he is liable to the draft all the way to age 35 and General Hershey very much wants to keep it this way. His method is to apply institutionalized "uncertainty." He even propounds this in the name of helping the human race.

"I am going to say that in life we will never remove uncertainty, and it would ruin the human race if we did. Uncertainty is the thing that keeps us alive and keeps us active and keeps us thinking. . . . So I don't happen to believe that we run the United States to keep our citizens necessarily completely certain. . . . The United States just dare not leave its citizens believing that they escape liability anytime until they die. . . . I never promise a youngster that he can get out under any circumstances. . . . Even if he got out today this is no sign he will get out tomorrow." A little further he adds with respect to ending all liability at age 26, "At the present time, we

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

need some incentive to keep a skilled man working in the national interest after he gets to be 26." (1966 *Hearings*, p. 9693)

There are two basic positions with respect to the relationship of government to those it governs. The first and the oldest, the one that has prevailed in most times and in most places, is that each citizen is there to serve the state. The second view, the one upon which the United States was founded, is the idea that the government is there to serve the citizens and the service it provides is the protection of individual rights.

To which tradition does General Hershey belong? If there is any doubt remaining about it, after he claimed that liability should not end until death, he states, "I am not concerned with the uncertainty involved in keeping our citizenry believing that they owe something to their country. There are too many, too many people that think individualism has to be completely recognized, even if the group rights go to the devil." (1966 *Hearings*, p. 9693) And this not an isolated remark; it is one of Hershey's characteristic ways of putting the issue. Elsewhere in the same hearings he said, "I think we have gone way hogwild on the individual rights in this country." (p. 9721)

The two basic views of the nature of government might be characterized in the following manner. If you hold that to govern means to force citizens to provide services for the state which will achieve state interests, whether or not these interests are called the preservation of freedom, the propagation of the faith, the glorification

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the master race, or provision for the common good, then you believe in the practicality of compulsion. All absolute kings, all dictators, all tyrants implicitly or explicitly hold this as a basic governing principle.

The opposing view is that of the practicality of volition. Historically, this view is radically new. In fact, its first embodiment in a government was in the founding of the United States. The Founding Fathers held that governing must be based on volition (the consent of the citizens), because this is the proper form of government, and because when men choose their own goals and actions they are more effective than when someone chooses for them. Men cannot be shaped morally by others, only by themselves, which means that standards cannot be arbitrarily implanted in their souls by compulsion.

General Hershey believes in the practicality of compulsion. The draft is necessary to make the system go, and it is the exercise of choice which would be a threat to the nation.

"I think you are going to have to compel people to get better. The incentives for staying as they are are too great at the present time, because it means avoidance of a duty that a person in a democratic society owes, and I happen to believe that we will get people better when we compel them to better themselves." (1966 *Hearings*, p. 9647) We defer citizens only to make them "more valuable to the government, and we intend to use them as we need them, rather than letting them go to college merely because they care to, themselves." (p. 9683) About those specialists who have completed his "carroted" education, he

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

says, "I think you should keep a string on them so if you want to use them you can and you can compel them to stay where you want them because you have a string on them and if they do not stay where they should, then you put them where you can be sure that you use them." (p. 9697) What of those rejected for military service? Compulsion can work miracles here, too. "I think a fellow should be compelled to become better and not let him use his discretion whether he wants to get smarter, more healthy, or more honest." (p. 9705)

Now that we can see clearly that Hershey sees the draft as an instrument to shape men, with a function far beyond that of national defense, we may wonder why he considers this shaping so necessary. He is afraid that, if left to his own devices, everyone will suddenly stop.

As he sees it, few would choose the national interest. Instead, if left alone they will let the nation down by allowing themselves to deteriorate mentally, physically and morally until they are no longer of use. As he says, "This worries me. . . . You are not going to have a democracy when you get to the place when not more than 20 or 30 percent of the individuals can carry the responsibilities." (1966 *Hearings*, p. 9656)

Those who should serve must be saved if the nation is to last. This thesis was expressed by him again and again and again during the 1966 Hearings. That is the mission of the military draft. Granting that with things the way they are the Armed Forces can't use everybody, he stated, "Personally, I believe that one

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of these days we are going to be forced to use the Armed Forces as the only agency available to raise the quality of our citizenship . . . educationally, physically, and/or morally." (1966 *Hearings*, p. 9636) And again, "The Armed Forces are better able to live with the unruly, ignorant, and physically unfit than any other agency of Government that I know of, and that is one of the reasons why I think they are going to have the job of straightening these people up." (p. 9689)

One must not forget who it is who will be defining unruliness, ignorance, and physical unfitness. Ultimately, there is no one who could not be included in these categories, one way or another.

And that is pretty much what he has in mind, which is no surprise from a man who said with respect to Universal Military Training, "You can't get more universal than I can." (1966 *Hearings*, p. 9656) His overall plan for those now classified as undraftable is as follows. "I would hope in maybe 10 years from now we would be taking 500,000 or 600,000 more for three purposes: First, to bring them up to an educational level . . . that they could meet the minimum standards for getting into the service; secondly, that those who are physically disqualified . . . should be brought up to . . . standards . . . and that we try to do something about juvenile delinquency . . . trying to teach control and discipline . . . and patriotism." (p.9705)

While the military would be charged with this task, it should not come out of the military budget. He even hints that it would be necessary to cut *educational* budgets, transferring the funds

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to "controlled groups such as the Armed Forces."

At the present time, and for the next ten years or so, the number of young men reaching draft age each year will be about two million. General Hershey does not think small. His plan would take about one half of them. There is no doubt that he would like them all. "The law is perfectly adequate to bring everybody in but you have to have more money." (1966 *Hearings*, p. 9705)

Just what would General Hershey have these "controlled groups" teach, if they are to be the recipients of educational funds? He is never very explicit, but one gets a hint from the following. "We ought to use whatever money we are spending for the uplift of our citizenry. . . we have to be more basic in teaching people good citizenship, patriotism, and that sort of thing, and then if we have a little time, let's give them some more knowledge. But we will never fail because we are stupid. We may fail because we do not believe in our country." (1966 *Hearings*, p. 9705)

For Hershey, the essence of a useful citizen is what that citizen feels, not what he thinks. Like all proponents of the practicality of compulsion, he takes the mind for granted. Somehow, men become the specialists which are such an all-important natural resource. Just grab them and march them off briskly to their desks, books and tools and it will just happen. What you have to watch out for is how they feel about it all . . . and there the control and discipline of military life will straighten them out, and then we'll have the kind of men we need to defend us.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not even donkeys, in the tiny range of their consciousnesses, for all their passion for carrots, are this simple.

It is hard to believe that this entire attitude stands uncontradicted on the record of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives of the United States. But General Hershey's is the single most important voice that the young American man will hear. The fact of the draft touches every career that each young man considers as he emerges from boyhood, touches every dream of the future, and every evaluation of himself and his world. If Hershey were alone, a frustrated totalitarian with no power, his views would seem like a subject for satire. But he is not alone. I have cited him here at such length because he is the most explicit representative of a kind of public figure--the compulsion-advocate who believes that everyone should go into the military to have his character molded for the good of the Nation.

Numerous colonels, generals, and commanders of veterans groups, as well as many congressmen, see some form of Universal Military Training as the only salvation for the Nation. In fact, the most prestigious general of them all, former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, has come out for a program which differs only in procedural detail from that of General Hershey. One would think perhaps that these gentlemen have gone as far as possible in the pursuit of a society prodded in the desired direction by compulsion. But their perimeters are only military, even though they embrace all young men.

Early in this article, it was pointed out that no one ever defines the national interest. Yet the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

law assumes that the more than 4,000 local draft boards know what it is, because they are the ones who apply it when they grant deferments. Actually, everyone knows who should be deferred "in the national interest." It is anyone who is good at producing "useful" goods and services. Congress specifically named such categories as students of medicine, dentistry, optometry and osteopathy, and draft boards experience no difficulty in looking at each individual potential draftee and evaluating him for his social usefulness and productiveness, actual or potential.

But to really evaluate usefulness to the national interest, one must ask, what are they going to be used for? Generals Eisenhower and Hershey have a relatively uncomplicated answer--to defend the country. But there is another kind of advocate of compulsion who leaps out of the narrowness of military purpose into purposes that are virtually endless.

On May 18, 1966, in an address before the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Montreal, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara made a statement which had been cleared with the White House and with which the Department of State completely agreed. He said, "Our present Selective Service System draws on only a minority of eligible young men. That is an inequity. It seems to me that we could move toward remedying that inequity by asking every young person in the U.S. to give one or two years of service to his country--whether in one of the military services, in the Peace Corps or in some other volunteer developmental work at home or abroad."

The next day it was heatedly denied by the White

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

House that McNamara had advocated a draft for civilian work. They emphasized that his verb was "asking." However, if one looks at the passage above it should be noted that "asking" applies equally to military service, where "asking" at present means compulsion, and to the non-military civilian services. In context it could only mean compulsion. Quite possibly this is an example of government by trial balloon, of running a notion up the flag pole to see if anybody blows his top. A lot of congressmen did just that, and so the equivocation was fallen back upon.

Last November, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz proposed what he called a "policy for youth." He would compulsorily register all young people at the age of 18. Each youth would then go before an "opportunity board" whose staff would examine the registrant physically, psychologically and educationally in order to aim him toward "meaningful employment" or into a "broadscale national service program of military or nondefense service."

He claimed that this board would have no authority to compel someone to take any particular course of action. "There would, however, be insistence that he, or she, use the opportunities afforded," he said. He added that "ideally" the program should be voluntary since he admitted that it might otherwise be unconstitutional. The equivalent of the deferment "carrot" that Hershey uses to shape society was a suggestion that young people might make arrangements to finance suggested education by borrowing from the government social security benefits they hadn't earned yet.

Wirtz' assumption of the necessity of compulsion was sharply revealed in one remark. "It becomes

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

then a fair bargain that the affording of the opportunity warrants insistence on the obligation to use it." The justification for this "insistence" is that the program is educational. Wirtz called it a way "to arrange for every American boy and girl to proceed along the course--educational, employment, training, or service--that he or she wants *or ought to take.*" (Italics mine.)

These are not the only two times that national service has been proposed. What is sobering about these proposals is that both are by cabinet officials, who, like General Hershey, are honored by their colleagues. Yet in each of these proposals there was a whisper of acknowledgment of the importance of the voluntary. McNamara denied the all-too-clear meaning of his use of the word "asking," and Wirtz, in making his proposal, hedged back and forth as to how much of it would be open to choice.

But not so Senator Jacob K. Javits. He does not deny or hedge. Nor would he dangle any carrots before the noses of the populace. His proposed resolution 166 (offered in the 89th Congress, Second Session) would leave nothing to the hazards of individual choice. He calls his program "universal national service." In his resolution, he called for the implementation of a program which would 1) require national service of all males before they reach the age of 35, with priority given to military service but including non-military service; 2) identify jobs in state and federal government which would qualify as non-military service; 3) use deferment to "encourage the timely pursuit of higher education in the national interest," with ultimate service being rendered in the specialty

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

learned; 4) provide facilities outside of the military to rehabilitate those found to be physically or mentally unqualified for service; and 5) set up a national service board for the non-military services which would identify assignments and administer those serving in these assignments.

There is little of the proposals of Hershey, Eisenhower, McNamara, or Wirtz that Javits has omitted, except possibly women, which Wirtz did include. It would not be long before they were also included under Javits' program.

When asked if by non-military service he meant the limited-service status of World War II, Javits answered, "I had that in mind, and the new opportunities which are opened up by sacrificial jobs, the type of the VISTA and the type of the Peace Corps, the type of those called for in AID, and the less popular and attractive jobs in hospitals and in insane asylums which go begging today, where national service should be recognized as a form in which the young man who is not able to serve in the Armed Forces . . . may nevertheless give that kind of sacrificial national service." (1966 *Hearings*, p. 9913)

So it is not only national service that is required, but *sacrificial* national service. Young men, to the extent to which they are fit, are to be at the beck and call of the mad, infirm, poverty-stricken, alcoholic, unfortunate, or emotionally ill. But why? Here Javits differs from the other advocates of compulsion. His resolution attempts to identify goals, to say just what this national interest is. The introduction of his resolution states the reasons for the proposal as being in part as follows: ". . . the Nation's

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

responsibilities in domestic and world affairs is [sic] rapidly increasing" and "the Nation's domestic responsibilities and role in world leadership will continue to challenge our collective talents and resources."

He continues by saying that "it is in the Nation's first interest to fully develop and employ its resources to optimum productivity, and that the youth of America are the Nation's greatest resource upon whom ultimately will fall the challenge of world peace, national security, and prosperity." There it is. The national interest is the entire world: world affairs, world peace, and world leadership. The task is infinite, and it is no wonder that it will require "sacrificial national service."

Why must we accept this burden? Because it is there. Why do none of the proposers of these programs seem to have any idea that what they are suggesting is slavery? What allows them to turn their attention away from the horrid fact of what they are suggesting?

General Hershey's escape seems to be that for him the prime political unit is "democracy," the people as a whole. In an article by Keith R. Johnson entitled "Who Shall Serve?" in the February 1966 *Atlantic*, the general is quoted as saying, "What I'm proposing isn't like Hitler. If this country decided to do this kind of thing [forcefully rehabilitate those unfit for military service], it would be the people who decided to do it, and not some dictator." Now his remarks about the evils of sacrificing group rights to individual rights make sense, if you see that he considers the individual as poten-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tially imperiling the group. "I think you will run a risk of not carrying out the mission of your system if you [go] completely over [to] individual rights, because if you give everybody their individual rights you won't send anybody into the Armed Forces." (1966 *Hearings*, p. 9722)

The same antipathy to the individual lies behind Javits' reasoning, but he is also influenced by our educational tradition. "In the final analysis our Nation's future is both the legacy and responsibility of the youth of America. Accordingly, the issue should not be approached as involuntary servitude to the state, which is not an American concept, but rather as a question of how best can we equip our youth of today for the challenge of tomorrow." (1966 *Hearings*, p. 9909)

The prime political units here are two collective lumps, "the youth of America" and "we". It is not slavery if "we" take the youth and shape them to be what it is our responsibility to shape them for. On the contrary, it is merely carrying out further the fine tradition of free, public, compulsory education which is one of the most respected of American institutions. What is a truant officer but one who compels the youth of today to be equipped for the challenge of tomorrow? If it is our responsibility to force the young by government decree to prepare themselves for life in a certain required way, why can't we, in the light of what Javits called "gigantic tasks, both foreign and domestic," force them to prepare themselves until age 35? It is not slavery, say the advocates of this view, if one group trains another for the national interest, the common good. The national interest is, after all, the interest of the trainees, even if they have to be forced to see it.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But it is slavery, whether the service is imposed by the wisdom of administrative officials, or by the vote of the multitude. Any compulsion, no matter whose interest it is supposed to serve, is in direct contradiction to the principle upon which this country was founded. And somewhere, not too far below the surface, advocates of compulsion like General Hershey and Senator Javits know that it is. Even if, for the present at least, the carrot rather than the stick is being used to make the donkey go.

Not "like Hitler," General Hershey? Not "involuntary servitude," Senator Javits? Why, whatever made you think in those terms?

--David J. Dawson

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REVIEWS

Argument From Obsolescence

The Wrong Man in Uniform: Our Unfair and Obsolete Draft--And How We Can Replace It, by Bruce K. Chapman, Trident Press, New York, 1967

Why is the wrong man in uniform? How did he get there? Who wants to keep him there? How do we go about putting the right man in uniform? These are the questions posed by Bruce K. Chapman in his short (146 pages) examination of the current draft system. Unfortunately, however, the subtitle of the book weakens the effect of Chapman's statistics. The subtitle refers to the "unfair and obsolete draft." Granted that it is unfair to force a young man to leave the chosen course of his life at the dictate of the government and to enter the military. Granted that such a system which relies upon the legal violation of rights must be replaced. But this has been true of every draft in history, and to state that the draft is obsolete is to state that it was a valid institution at one time. Which is indeed Chapman's position.

The argument is divided into three segments, the three parts of the book. Part I deals with the inherent inequity of the draft system and its related schedule of deferments. The reason for this situation is, as Chapman explains, that the Selective Service boards are made up of all manner

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of civil servants and part-time volunteers, whose attitudes range from the lenient to the callous. What results (because of local autonomy in the draft boards) is a wide variance in the methods by which the draft is enforced.

Information is rarely available to the registrant about the sixty or more ways in which to fulfill his military obligation. Even less information is available about the legal methods of avoiding military service. The major factor in the injustice of the draft, however, according to Chapman, is that the aim of the deferment schedule is not the minimization of injustice, but rather whatever any official interprets as the national interest, correlated with the size of the potential draft pool in each draft board area for each particular period of time. In other words, a young man's deferment is very likely to depend upon the number of his contemporaries and the number of enlistments in his area, rather than on the merits of his own case.

Two other factors that add to the inequality of the deferment system are the loaded standards and the frequent clogging of what Chapman calls the "pipeline." College deferments are not just given out generally, but are given first to those entering the more socially or militarily useful occupations (by whatever standards these may be chosen) and only later to other students. The draft deferment test for college students is loaded toward science and mathematics.

Those registrants not caught up in this turmoil may be subject to an even more unsettling situation when they encounter the bureaucratic

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"pipeline" upon the occasion of their classification physical. If one is classified 1-A, he still may not know whether or not the system *officially* knows that he is available for induction. This is because his papers have been held up and his draft board doesn't itself know where they are. Throughout the system there is a vast ignorance concerning the vital issue of the number of draftable youths. Thus, the selection process is made even more arbitrary than the system will admit.

Having shown how chaotic the Selective Service System is in its impact on the individual, Chapman proceeds to the arguments and the alternatives being put forth in the present debate. What is of primary interest in this part of the book is the claim that the ones supporting the draft most vehemently are also those in charge of investigating the issue (Rep. L. Mendel Rivers, head of the House Armed Services Committee) or in control of the necessary information (General Hershey and Secretary Robert S. McNamara). This group Chapman terms the "draft lobby." To support this claim, Chapman cites, among other things, the constant delays of committee hearings on the subject of the draft in 1966. Nothing can correct such blatant tactics, says Chapman, except making the draft a public issue. But even this possibility is reduced by the fact that the renewal date of the draft law always falls in an odd-numbered (non-election) year, a carefully protected "coincidence."

Chapman next proceeds to handle some of the arguments both for and against the draft. The pro-draft argument he spends the most time on is that the draft benefits society. The anti-draft argument that he attacks is that the draft makes the poor fight the battles of the rich.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The first argument he handles well by showing that, in fact, the draft's only "contribution to society" is that of a two-year indoctrination period for the benefit of the military. He states, in this respect, "Indeed, potentially, the draft is the ally, not the challenger, of authoritarianism, a potent threat to liberty, not its guarantor. The power to impose the 'privilege of service' in the draft is intrinsically dangerous in a free society." (p. 78)

The anti-draft argument of what Chapman calls the "povertarians" (such as Michael Harrington) that the draft is unfair to the poor, and especially the Negro poor, is handled less fundamentally. He examines some statistics and comes to the tentative conclusion that the disadvantaged probably have more chance of escaping the draft than the rest of the population, rather than less. He also calls attention to the high re-enlistment rate among Negroes, as a correlation which povertarians seldom acknowledge, but without making any clear point.

Finally, the author approaches the alternatives to the present system. The three he examines are the lottery system of selection, national or universal service, and the volunteer army. The lottery Chapman rejects, for the obvious reason that it increases the arbitrariness of the draft's impact upon the individual. National or universal service (either including or excluding women) is also rejected. Chapman states that it would be a clear violation of rights, but emphasizes the practical side of the issue even more. The point which he elaborates on is that the present draft system is unfair primarily because it has too many people to draft from; therefore increasing the rolls

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the potential draftees will only make the situation more unfair. As to the proposal to expand the jobs to be filled by the draft into the area of welfare services, Chapman's comment is merely: "Voluntarism, after all, has been an essential ingredient in our nation's greatness." (p. 94)

The whole of the third part of this book deals with the feasibility of a volunteer army. Here Chapman outlines the means of obtaining a volunteer army--by raising pay scales to levels commensurate with the market rate. As a matter of fact, he points to such glaring examples of underpayment in our armed forces that one might indeed wonder that enlistments are as high as they are at the present time. For example, one study showed that about 5,000 Air Force men, in the middle pay ranges, are collecting welfare to support their families. Many thousands moonlight to supplement their incomes. Over one-fourth of the Armed Forces are paid less than they could collect in unemployment compensation as civilians.(p. 117)

Areas where savings could be effected to reduce the consequences of the necessary drastic raise in pay scales are numerous: turnover, training (basic training costs about $6,000 per man), and the shifting of training personnel into active service. Chapman estimates that savings from these three areas alone might run about $5 billion per year.

Other advantages would begin to appear once the draft had been eliminated. These are the less tangible yet more important psychic rewards of doing an important patriotic job. Chapman cites a recent example of such a reward to a crack volunteer outfit: Kennedy's allowing of the green

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

beret as part of the unit's uniform. The Green Berets are now famous, the beret giving them more *esprit* than medals, because it is distinctive to their unit, making it closer, in many respects, than any fraternity.

So far, I have given a rather close outline of the subjects dealt with in this book. I have done so for a particular reason: It contains the most comprehensive discussion yet presented to the general public in favor of a volunteer armed force and opposed to the drafting of individuals into the army. This book contains many facts that can be used in arguing against the draft, but as an argument it leaves something to be desired.

"The Selective Service System," Chapman states, "with its deferments and priorities and tests, undoubtedly was the best available means of recruiting soldiers in the low manpower days of World War II and Korea. Times change fairly quickly however (though one wouldn't guess it listening to the arguments of the draft's defenders) and the fraudulent banner of 'Universal Military Training' under which the present system marches is symptomatic of the draft's obsolescence. . . . [The draft's] central fault, from which inefficiencies and inequities spring, is the declining necessity of any draft at all." (p. 81)

Here we have not only a total reliance on the argument from obsolescence, but a hint that things wouldn't be so bad if it were considered necessary for military training to be truly universal. In arguing that the draft is obsolete, Chapman fails to identify that the draft

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was just as unjust a means of recruitment in the days of World War I, when men served only as masses of cannon fodder, as it is today, when they have to be trained to highly technical positions in order to utilize modern sophisticated weapons systems. That one has to think to operate efficiently in today's army only makes the impracticality of force more obvious, it doesn't raise the issue for the first time in history.

The striking deficiency of this book is that is raises moral issues and then doesn't fully explore them. The author says, "the most damning moral criticism of a lottery system is that it would not come to grips with the new manpower facts of the nation and the military, that a smaller and smaller percentage of young men would be forced to sacrifice for the balance." (p.88) This is not a moral criticism of a lottery system; it is a criticism which says that a lottery would not be realistic.

One often hears the argument that a certain plan will work because "we need it so badly." This is a weak argument, and it is if anything weaker when used against, instead of for, a proposal. Calling it a moral argument doesn't strengthen it. In the quotation above, Chapman isn't debating the justice or the equality of the lottery. He is arguing that we don't need it, therefore it doesn't work, therefore it's bad.

This line of argument, unfortunately, is not atypical. It runs throughout the entire book. Arguments based upon equality of the law's impact and upon justice are only partially developed. Nowhere in this entire discussion is the draft properly attacked on the basis of man's rights. Any

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

argument that touches on this issue is thrown in as an extra barb, never fully or logically discussed. Worse, one might even get the impression, because of the obvious cursoriness of such remarks, that no development of such arguments can be made. It would have been a far better book had Chapman clearly stated that he was restricting himself to a purely practical study and was not debating the moral justification of the draft at all.

What Chapman has done instead is to make a brief practical study of the draft his sole basis for a moral conclusion. That is, his argument is basically pragmatism asserted as a moral position--the draft is wrong because there are at the moment enough men of the right age to ensure a volunteer army. He is clear in stating that a volunteer army is valid now because "our population and our national wealth are stupendously greater than they were. . . ." (p. 138) The final consequences of such a pragmatic argument are obvious in the following excerpt from his conclusion to Chapter 13:

"Someday the draft might have to be called upon again, with millions of Americans put into uniform to fight a massive land-war somewhere in the world. Hopefully, that is not likely, but by maintaining the files of the Selective Service, and requiring all young men, even under the volunteer military system, to be tested at age 18 and keeping their records current, the draft machinery could respond just as rapidly as it can now, should any situation requiring mass mobilization arise." (p. 135) How can such a position be reconciled with his previously quoted remark, "The power to impose the 'privilege of service' in the draft is intrinsically dangerous in a free society"? Only by supposing that,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in Mr. Chapman's mind, the military needs of the nation must of course be filled before it is relevant to consider the dangers of government power.

His argument, then, boils down to the statement that we should try a volunteer army as long as it works, but since we don't know how long it will work, stay ready to draft. If we redefine our needs tomorrow, it is valid to draft tomorrow.

The Wrong Man in Uniform thus becomes a discussion of some arguments about the draft, instead of a convincing argument itself. It supplies a small stock of statistics to those who wish to argue against the draft. More than this is available from the published Hearings of the House Armed Services Committee. In any case, statistics are only good if one has one's own arguments. To rely solely upon Chapman's arguments would be to give up the debate by default.

There are two grievous faults in this little book, particularly from the point of view of this reviewer, who is himself registered and deferred. Its argument from obsolescence, which the author admits is only useful as long as wars stay small and "limited," is too terrifyingly weak on an issue of such vital importance; and the cursory moral discussion throughout the book itself is too unforgivably small to cover an issue with such far-reaching totalitarian ramifications.

--Lowell B. Wiltbank

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PERSUASION, INC.
260 WEST 86th ST.
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10024
RETURN REQUESTED

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED